

## **REMARKS**

With claims 1-38 originally pending, claims 21-31 are currently under consideration, claims 1-20 and 32-38 having been withdrawn under a restriction requirement. With this Response, claims 21, 27 and 28 have been amended as described in detail below.

### **Section 102, Rejection**

Claims 21-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Khandros et al. (U.S. Patent 6,330,164, hereinafter Khandros) The Office Action states that Khandros discloses the system as shown in its Figs. 2-4. Regarding claims 21 and 25, the Office Action states that Khandros discloses:

a substrate (substrate 10-fig. 2, col. 3, lines 24, 38) having conductors (pad 22, column 3, line 24) formed thereon,

a base IC die (12, col. 3, line 18) having a first surface (a surface including bypass capacitor chip 11) facing the substrate (10) and a second surface parallel to the first surface (fig. 2)

a first secondary IC die (chip 11, col. 3, lines 32-33) residing between the first surface of the base IC (12) and the substrate (10) and linked to the first surface of the base IC die (11) through first conductive signal paths (23A, col. 3, line 32), and

conductive contacts comprising resilient spring contacts (20, col. 3, line 20) extending between the first surface of the base IC die (12) and the conductors on the substrate (10) for conveying signals between the base IC die and the conductors on the substrate.

As to claim 22, the Office Action states that Khandros discloses solder (col. 3, line 25) forming the first conductive signal paths (23A). As to claims 23-24, the Office Action states that Khandros discloses that the substrate (10) is a PCB or semiconductor

substrate (col. 3, line 38). As to claim 26, the Office Action states that Khandros discloses the contacts were formed on the first surface of the base IC die (12) and soldered to the conductors (22) on substrate (10) (col. 3, lines 24-25). As to claim 27, the Office Action states that Khandros discloses that the contacts (21) formed on the first surface of the base IC die (12) and a spring contact socket (504 – Fig. 11, col. 13, lines 27-35) providing signal paths between the contacts and the conductors on the substrate.

Based on the above amendments and the following remarks, this rejection is now believed to be overcome.

Claim 21 has been amended to claim “wherein at least one of second signals provided between the first secondary IC die and the base IC die has a higher frequency than the first signals provided between the base IC die and the substrate.” This is disclosed in Applicant’s specification on page 7 in paragraph 35. Claim 21, as amended, is believe allowable as not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by Khandros.

Claims 22-27, and new claim 39 are believed allowable over Khandros based at least on their dependency on claim 21.

#### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 28-31 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but are indicated by the Office Action to be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, claims 28 and 29 have been rewritten in independent form. Claims 30-31 are believed allowable in dependent form based on their dependence on claim 29. Accordingly, all of claims 28-31 are now believed in condition for allowance.

## Conclusion

In light of the above amendments and remarks, claims 21-31 and 39 are now all believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4/27/04

By: Thomas Ward  
Thomas A. Ward  
Reg. No. 35,732

FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-4156  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800